REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. This amendment is believed to be fully responsive to all issues raised in the December 18, 2003, Office Action.

Claims 8-20 have been renumbered to claims 7-19, in accordance with the Office's renumbering. Applicant acknowledges that claims 1-19 are pending, as renumbered by the Office. Applicant acknowledges that the IDS received 10/9/2001 and 8/29/2003 has been considered.

Examiner Interview

The Applicant thanks the Examiner and her supervisor for their participation in an in-person interview with the Applicant's attorneys on February 9, 2004 to discuss this application. Claim 1 was discussed with regard to the Emmelmann reference, which was cited by the Office in the Office Action mailed December 18, 2003. Applicant's attorneys described patentable distinctions between the recitations of claim 1 and the teachings of Emmelmann.

Claim Objections

Renumbered claim 7 stands objected to because renumbered claim 7 recites, "A method as defined in claim 7...". Renumbered claim 7 has been amended to depend from claim 6.

Renumbered claims 11, 12, and 13 have been amended to change the phrase "for the web page for the web page" to --for the web page--. Renumbered claim 17 has been amended to delete the first use of "comprises". In renumbered claim

19, the phrase "...as defined in claim 20..." has been amended to read "...as defined in claim 18...".

Applicant respectfully requests that the foregoing claim objections be withdrawn.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejections of Claims 1 and 3-6 and Renumbered Claims 7-19

Claims 1 and 3-6, and renumbered claims 7-19 stand purportedly provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-6, and 9-20 of copending Application No. 09/573,768. Applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) to overcome the nonstatutory double patenting rejection.

Rejections of claim 1-6, and Renumbered Claims 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6 and renumbered claims 7-19 stand purportedly rejected over U.S. Patent Pre-Grant Publication 2003/0074634 to Emmelmann (hereinafter, Emmelmann). Applicant traverses these rejections. As will be described, the Office has failed to show that Emmelmann teaches or suggests all of the limitations of the claims of the present application.

Emmelmann creates server side internet applications using interactive server side components (ISSC's). See Emmelmann, paragraph [0025]. In Emmelmann, before components can be used, the components need to be programmed and predeveloped by a programmer. See Emmelmann, paragraphs [0075]-[0077] and [0157]. A component page in Emmelmann may reference such

components, but processing the component page does not produce source code representing control objects. By contrast, renumbered claims 1-10 of the present application recite processing a dynamic web page content file to <u>produce a source code file</u> and <u>compiling the source code</u> to produce a class from which a requested web page can be produced. Because Emmelmann does not process a dynamic web page content file to <u>produce source code</u> or <u>compile the source code</u>, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest all the elements of any of renumbered claims 1-10.

Specifically, claim 1 and renumbered claims 9 and 10 recite, in part, processing a dynamic web page to produce a source code file containing source code that represents control objects and compiling the source code to produce a class from which a set of hierarchical objects can be instantiated to produce a web page. The Office states that the processing step of claim 1 is disclosed in Fig. 8 in the component processing 37 and page generation 38 blocks of Emmelmann. With regard to blocks 37 and 38, Emmelmann discloses:

> "[0117] The ISSC processor evaluates the parameters of the request and determines if the user wants to interact with any components. If so, the component(s) are called to process the user input (37). The ISSC processor then processes the AST of the component page according to a page generation method. The result is a browser page (38)."

The foregoing description of blocks 37 and 38 and the cited description of an heitml page neither teach nor suggest processing a dynamic web page content file <u>to produce a source code file containing source code</u> that represents control objects declared in the web page content file.

In addition, the Office further asserts that a "heitml page is seen as a program and is processed in textual order." However, the heitml page (i.e., a component page) cannot correspond to **both** a dynamic web page content file and a source code file produced by processing of a dynamic web page content file.

The Office further asserts that the step of compiling the source code file to produce a class from which a set of hierarchical objects can be instantiated to produce web page authoring language that produces a web page for display is disclosed in paragraphs [0071], [0352], [0073], and [0090] of Emmelmann, cited portions reproduced below:

"...Components can be nested inside each other..."

"Inheritance is the major object oriented concept used for achieving reusability. Through inheritance it is possible to create several similar objects without specifying each one from scratch. Classes can inherit the methods of another class."

"By adding components to a page, the page becomes a dynamic page or server side application."

"Each component can have one, zero, or multiple component instances that are actually displayed."

The foregoing portions from Emmelmann mention inheritance and nesting, but the portions fail to teach or suggest compiling a source code file to produce a class from which a set of hierarchical objects can be instantiated to produce web page authoring language that produces a web page for display.

Accordingly, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of any of claim 1 and renumbered claims 9 and 10. As such, it is believed that claim 1 and renumbered claims 9 and 10 are allowable over Emmelmann, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, as renumbered, each depend in some form from claim 1, and therefore inherit all the elements of claim 1. Therefore, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of any of claims 2-8, as renumbered. As such, it is believed that claims 2-8, as renumbered, are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Renumbered claims 11-13 recite, in part, generating <u>a source code file</u> related to a dynamic web page content file based on an evaluation of a data model and <u>compiling the source code file</u> to create a compiled class in memory. The Office asserts that Emmelmann discloses generating a source code file related to a dynamic web page content file based on an evaluation of a data model at Fig. 9 and paragraph [0129]. Paragraph [0129] is the text description of Fig. 9, and is reproduced below:

"4. Generation Algorithm

[0129] FIG. 9 is a flow chart of the page generation algorithm. It is a recursive algorithm taking a cb-list as parameter 1. The cb-list 1 is processed node by node (51). If a node represents browser code (52), it is sent to the browser unchanged (53). If a node represents a component (52), the attributes of the component are evaluated (54). Then, the component class of the component is identified, i.e. the component class with the name of the component kind taken. The display method of the component is called (55). Processing continues with the next node of the component list (56)."

The foregoing text from Emmelmann may describe generating a page, but neither Fig. 9 nor the description of Fig. 9 in Emmelmann disclose or suggest generating source code. Simply put, the foregoing description of Emmelmann's Fig. 9 fails to teach or suggest generating a source code file related to a dynamic web page content file based on an evaluation of a data model.

The Office asserts that compiling the source code file to create a compiled class in memory is disclosed in Emmelmann in Fig. 9. However, no source code is mentioned in Fig. 9 or the description of Fig. 9 in Emmelmann, and therefore, Emmelmann fails to disclose or suggest compiling the source code file to create a compiled class in memory.

Accordingly, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of any of renumbered claims 11, 12, and 13. As such, it is believed that renumbered claims 11, 12, and 13 are allowable over Emmelmann, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Renumbered claim 14 recites, in part, processing a resource to generate a source code file related to the resource and compiling the source code file to create a compiled class in memory to enable the instantiation of objects of the compiled class. For the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and renumbered claims 9 and 10, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest processing a resource to generate a source code file and compiling the source code file to create a compiled class in memory to enable the instantiation of objects of the compiled class.

Accordingly, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of renumbered claim 14. As such, it is believed that renumbered claim 14 is allowable over Emmelmann, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Renumbered claims 15-19 each depend in some form from renumbered claim 14, and therefore inherit all the elements of renumbered claim 14. Therefore, Emmelmann fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of any of renumbered claims 15-19. As such, it is believed that renumbered claims 15-19 are allowable for at least the same reasons as renumbered claim 14, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Claims 1 – 19, as renumbered, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 2/23/04   By: _Damon A. Rieth signature_

Damon A. Rieth
Reg. No. 52,167
(303) 539-0265 x237